NOTES.

THREE EMENDATIONS IN AESCHYLUS.

1. *P.V.* 687 The words ἔα, ἔα, ἄπεχε, φεῦ certainly belong to Io. Both ἔα and ἄπεχε must be mis-translated if they belong to the Chorus.

2. *S.c.T.* 12 Read λασθησμὸν ἀλδαίνοντα σώματος πολύν, ὥραν τ᾽ ἔχονθ᾽ ἕκαστον ὥς τι συμπρεπές. ' Cherishing each for his life a great disdain, and husbanding it as a thing therewith accordant' (*i.e.* contemptible).

Hesych. λᾶσθαι· παίζειν, ὀλιγωρεῖν, λοιδορεῖν,
λασθαίνειν· κακολογεῖν.
λάσθη· χλεύη, λήθη, ὀλιγωρία etc.
λάσθω· χλευαζέτω.
λάσθων· κακολογῶν.

3. *S.c.T.* 1015 Read ὡς ὄντ᾽ ἂν ἀναστατῆρα for ὡς ὄντ᾽ ἀναστατῆρα.

W. G. RUTHERFORD.

* * *

ON TAC. *Hist.* II. 28. *fin.*

Si provincia urbe et salute imperii potior sit, omnes illuc sequerentur; sin victoriae sanitas sustentaculum columen in Italia verteretur, non abrumpendos ut corpori validissimos artus.

This defies translation : the general sense is 'if the safety of a province (Gallia Narbonensis) is of more consequence than that of the empire, then let our undivided forces go to the province—if not, do not let us dismember our army by sending a powerful detachment away when the crisis of the war approaches.' *sanitas sustentaculum* is given up by most editors: *columen* is retained by some in the sense of *fulcrum*: but neither for *columen* in this sense nor for the expression *columen verti* do I find any authority.

I propose *sin victoria incolumi in Italia verteretur*, and compare Verg. *Aen.* x. 529 *non hic victoria Teucrum | vertitur.* The process of corruption may have been that the *n* of *incolumi* (perhaps at the end of a line) became faint and the *i* attached to *victoria*, which was thus mis-read *victoriae*, a genitive which in turn helped to corrupt *-columi in Italia* to *columen in Italia* : this was still hard and a scribe looking up *columen* in Placidus found *columen*: *vel sanitas vel sustentaculum.* To this adscript we owe the traditional text.

W. S. HADLEY.

* * *

A SUPPOSED VARIANT IN CICERO *ad Att.* 1, 16, 12. —In an article in *Hermathena* (No. XIX. p. 356), Professor Purser in discussing cod. Additus 6793 of the Letters of Cicero to Atticus, calls attention to some noteworthy readings of this MS., and among others to the following.

I. 16 12 ut apud *iurantes* inquiri liceret, where all other MSS. give *magistratus* in place of *iurantes.* He comments as follows : 'This latter (*magistratus*) looks like a gloss on some word which named a special official. Could there be a reference to the *iuratores* who were officials under the censor, and had the power of demanding an oath from the taxpayer that he had made true return of his property, &c. ?'

Unless I am much mistaken, this curious reading can easily be explained as a simple error on the part of a scribe.

In the hand employed in this part of the MS. the word following apud is ιurant'. Now the regular way of writing magistratus in this MS. is m̌rat'. If there was a similar abbreviation in the exemplar of this manuscript, it is easily seen that ιurat' would be very like m̌rat', and that the first mistake was to transfer the sign of contraction to the second syllable, reading m̌rat' instead of m̌rat'. The resolution of m into ιu would be a matter of course, and we should have the actual form ιurant'. This explanation seems much easier to accept than to suppose so striking a variant in the MS.

SAMUEL BALL PLATNER.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the EDITOR *of the* CLASSICAL REVIEW.

Sir,

My attention has been called to a note by Mr. Marindin in your June number, p. 243, referring to a short article of mine on Hannibal's Pass in the March number of the *Geographical Journal.* The context of that note clearly indicates me as holding that παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν might have been said by Polybius ' of an army marching *across ridges* ' —the italics are mine—' parallel to or in the general direction of the river,' If Mr. Marindin will take the trouble to look at my article again, he will see that, so far from saying this, I take Hannibal, in the part of his route to which the παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν relates, by the same valleys of the Isère and the Drac by which he also takes him. I may add that Mr. Marindin's explanation of the Pass which Pompey opened is certainly ingenious, but he needlessly detracts from its novelty when, referring to what has been the most common under-

standing of Varro, he remarks that he thinks 'Varro's statement is misunderstood by Mr. Westlake.'

Yours faithfully,
J. WESTLAKE.

CHELSEA, *July 12th.*

I HOPE that I may be allowed to express my regret for having mistaken the inference which Mr. Westlake drew from the varying expressions παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν and παρ᾽ αὐτὸν τὸν ποταμόν.

I should also like to take this opportunity of adding a further explanation of the theory which I ventured to put forward about Pompey's pass. I have been asked, since my article appeared in June, whether there is any historical reason for supposing that Pompey, on his way to Spain, invented the more northerly route by the Col de Lautaret, leading towards Valence, instead of simply following the valley of the Durance to its end. I think that there is a reason; for it is a natural inference from Caes. *B.C.* i. 35 that he reduced the Helvii to submission on his way to Spain; and the Helvii in Caesar's time lived at the north of the Roman Province. Pompey might, of course, have got to them by marching northwards after he crossed the Rhone; but certainly the most direct way of reaching their territory from the top of the Genèvre was to strike for the Isère valley by the Col de Lautaret and cross the Rhone somewhere about Valence.

G. E. MARINDIN.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

HOGARTH'S *AUTHORITY AND ARCHAEOLOGY.*

Authority and Archaeology : Sacred and Profane. Edited by D. G. HOGARTH. London : John Murray. 1899. 16s.

THE greater part of this work falls outside the field which the *Classical Review* surveys : but some chapters of it may well come under our consideration. Such are Mr Hogarth's chapter on Prehistoric Greece and his Preface, Professor Ernest Gardner's chapter on Historic Greece, and Mr. Haverfield's on the Roman World. Before the book came out, I was sceptical as to the possibility of including in a single volume any account of Archaeology in its various branches sufficiently detailed to be of much use to students. The perusal of the work itself has modified that view. Ordinary educated readers will find in Prof. Driver's chapters an excellent and judicial summary of the light thrown by archaeological investigation on the books of the Old Testament. But in order to attain his end Dr. Driver has to occupy 152 pages. If an attempt had been made to deal on the same scale with archaeological discovery in relation to the works of Greek and Roman writers, not one volume would have sufficed, nor two.

In the Preface, Mr. Hogarth briefly sets forth his view as to the proper matter of Archaeology. He distinguishes between a Greater Archaeology which is the 'science of all the human past,' and a Lesser Archaeology which is the 'science of the treatment of the material remains of the human past.' A third kind of Archaeology, signifying 'the propaedeutic training of the aesthetic faculty by the study of style in antique art,' Mr. Hogarth mentions, but says that he has no concern with it. By 'material remains' as the province of the Lesser Archaeology Mr. Hogarth means such remains as are not literary. This 'science of the material remains of the human past' is, of course, what most people mean by Archaeology. But how a single step is to be made in it without a 'study of the style in antique art,' I cannot see. Mr. Hogarth cannot mean to say that in archaeology there is one method for beautiful things and another for ugly or ordinary remains. The meanest of prehistoric potsherds has style—of a kind ; and it is only by studying its style that archaeology can class it. Mr. Hogarth's third sort of archaeology remains therefore to me an absolute enigma.

The most important line to be drawn in archaeology is that between remains which can be interpreted by literary and historic